

September 30, 2021

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
HOUSTON DIVISION**

[illegible]


On September 29, 2021, Plaintiff filed her Objections. Dkt. 71. In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C), this Court is required to “make a de novo determination of those portions of the [magistrate judge’s] report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection [has been] made.” After conducting this de novo review, the Court may “accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate judge.” *Id.*; *see also* FED. R. CIV. P. 72(b)(3).

The Court has carefully considered the Objections; the Memorandum and Recommendation; the pleadings; and the record. The Court **ACCEPTS** Judge Edison's Memorandum and Recommendation and **ADOPTS** it as the opinion of the Court. To be clear, nothing in Judge Edison's Memorandum and Recommendation, or this Order adopting the Memorandum and Recommendation, is intended to suggest that Defendants were (or were not) Plaintiff's single employer. That is an issue for the arbitrator to decide. It is therefore **ORDERED** that:

- (1) Judge Edison's Memorandum and Recommendation (Dkt. 70) is **APPROVED and ADOPTED** in its entirety as the holding of the Court;
- (2) S&D's Motion to Dismiss or, in the Alternative, Compel Arbitration (Dkt. 50) is **GRANTED** in part and **DENIED** in part;
- (3) JMT's Motion for Summary Judgment (Dkt. 54) is **GRANTED in so far as it requests the Court refer the matter to arbitration**; and
- (4) All claims brought by Plaintiff are referred to arbitration and this matter is **STAYED** pending resolution of the arbitration.

It is so **ORDERED**.

SIGNED and ENTERED this 30th day of September 2021.



GEORGE C. HANKS, JR.
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE